REMARKS

Claims 1-35 and 107-110 have been canceled. Claims 36-106 are now pending in the application, of which claims 44-100 and 102-106 have been withdrawn from consideration. Applicants amend claims 36 and 101 for further clarification. No new matter has been added.

Claims 36, 41-43, and 101 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,875,231 to Farfan et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,915,012 to Miloslavsky; claim 37 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Farfan et al. in view of Miloslavsky, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,577,111 to Iida et al.; and claims 38-40 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Farfan et al. in view of Miloslavsky, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,692,033 to Farris. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

The Examiner conceded that Farfan et al. failed to disclose the claimed features in connection with request information for controlling communications, and relied upon Miloslavsky as a combining reference that allegedly suggests these features . Page 3, line 9 et seq. of the Office Action.

Miloslavsky only describes, however, a switch 168 and a switch 182 being connected via a "tie-line 188":

> "**Tie-line**. A tie-line* is a voice channel between two PBXs. It is just like a trunk between two CO's, except that it is called a line and not a trunk. After all, in a PBX, a trunk is a channel that connects to a CO where it is called a line.
> [* FOOTNOTE: The proper terminology ultimately became "tie trunk"]"
> - "Chapter 2: Unscrewing the Inscrutable: Some Communications Jargon,""Voice Communication in Business Volume 1 Essays on telecommunications, 1969-1980" [http://www.leegoeller.com/VC1/VC1-04.htm]. (underline added for emphasis)

Thus, Miloslavsky, as cited and relied upon by the Examiner—and correspondingly, the proposed combination of references—fails to disclose or suggest computer telephony integration control request information features for a call between a first telephony device and a second telephony device through a public telephone network. Furthermore, neither Farfan et al. nor Miloslavsky includes any disclosure or suggestion for computer telephony integration control request information being communicated so that a computer telephony integration server unit executes a camp-on control between such second telephony device and first telephony device.

Thus, even assuming, arguendo, that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the claimed invention was made to combine Farfan et al. and Miloslavsky, such a combination would still have failed to disclose or suggest,

> "[a] computer telephony integration client unit for transmitting computer telephony integration control request information for use in requesting computer telephony integration control to a computer telephony integration server unit, comprising:
>
> a computer telephony integration control request information editing unit that edits the computer telephony integration control request information when a call from ***a first telephony device*** connected with a first private branch exchange to ***a second telephony device*** connected with a second private branch exchange ***through a public telephone network*** cannot be connected due to the second telephony device being busy; and
>
> a communications control unit that communicates with the computer telephony integration server unit through a computer network the computer telephony integration control request information and information relating to the computer telephony integration control request information so that the computer telephony integration server unit executes a camp-on control ***between the second telephony device and the first telephony device*** by controlling the second private branch exchange using the received computer telephony integration control request information," as recited in claim 36. (Emphasis added)

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 36, together with claims 41-43 dependent therefrom, is patentable over Farfan et al. and Miloslavsky, separately and in combination, for at least the above-stated reasons. Claim 101 incorporates features that correspond to those of claim 36 cited above, and is, therefore, patentable over the cited references for at least the same reasons.

The Examiner cited Iida et al. and Farris as combining references to respectively address the additional features recited in claims 37-40, which depend from claim 36. As such, combinations with these references would still have failed to cure the above-described deficiencies of Farfan et al. and Miloslavsky in connection with claim 36. And thus, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 37-40, dependent from claim 36, are patentable over the cited references for at least the above-stated reasons.

In view of the remarks set forth above, this application is in condition for allowance which action is respectfully requested. However, if for any reason the Examiner should consider this application not to be in condition for allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned attorney at the number listed below prior to issuing a further Action.

Any fee due with this paper may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-1290.

Respectfully submitted,

/Dexter T. Chang/
Dexter T. Chang
Reg. No. 44,071

CUSTOMER NUMBER 026304
Telephone: (212) 940-6384
Fax: (212) 940-8986 or 8987
Docket No.: 100794-00578 (FUJO 14.947A)
DTC:tb